

i. Proposal number:# 2001-E210*

ii. Short proposal title .# Sun River Property Habitat Restoration*

APPLICABILITY TO CALFED ERP GOALS AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

1a1. Link to ERP Strategic Goals: What Strategic Goal(s) is /are addressed by this proposal? List the letter(s) of all that apply.

A. At-risk species

B. Rehabilitate natural processes

C. Maintain harvested species

D. Protect-restore functional habitats

E. Prevent non-native species and reduce impacts

F. Improve and maintain water quality# D, A*

1a2. Describe the degree to which the proposal will contribute to the relevant goal. Quantify your assessment and identify the contribution to ERP targets, when possible.# This proposal will make its primary benefits in restoring a variety of habitats including Delta slough, perennial aquatic, fresh emergent wetland, seasonal wetland, riparian, and grassland. Species that depend on those habitats will benefit.*

1b. Objectives: What Strategic Objective(s) is/are addressed by this proposal? List Objective (from the table of 32 objectives) and describe potential contribution to ERP Goals. Quantify your assessment, when possible.# Goal 4, Objective 1, restore habitats. This proposal will provide 17 acres of slough habitat, 17 acres of tidal perennial aquatic, 77 acres of fresh emergent wetlands, 15 acres of riparian and riverine aquatic, 80 acres of seasonal wetlands, and 115 acres of perennial/annual grasslands.*

1c. Restoration Actions: Does the proposal address a Restoration Action identified in Section 3.5 of the PSP? Identify the action and describe how well the proposed action relates to the identified Restoration Action.# This proposal addresses several ecological uncertainties related to habitat restoration. These include the PSP categories "flood management as an ecosystem tool," shallow water, tidal and freshwater marsh habitat, "beyond the riparian corridor," and "non-native invasive species." The answer or contribution to each element will be incremental, but the interesting approach is the integration of all four within a clearly defined geographic area.*

1d. Stage 1 Actions: Is the proposal linked directly, indirectly or not linked to proposed

Stage 1 Actions? If linked, describe how the proposal will contribute to ERP actions during

Stage 1.# Yes. The elements of this

proposal are directly linked to Stage 1 actions. The Stage 1 actions include restoration of a variety of habitats in the Delta, the use of flood plain easements consistent with ecosystem restoration and flood control needs, and implementing non-native invasive species control and eradication projects including evaluation, and provide incremental benefits through the addition of habitat corridors.*

1e. MSCS: Describe how the proposal is linked to the Multi-Species Conservation Strategy and if it's consistent with the MSCS Conservation measures. Identify the species addressed and whether the proposal will

"recover", "contribute to recovery" or "maintain" each species.# This proposal specifically addresses the giant garter snake and the valley elderberry longhorn beetle. In addition, it would benefit greater sandhill crane and other shore and wading birds. The habitat to be restored include the NCCP habitat designations of tidal perennial aquatic, valley riverine aquatic, nontidal freshwater emergent, natural seasonal wetland, and grassland.*

1f. Information Richness/Adaptive Probing related to the proposal: Describe the degree to which the proposal provides information to resolve one of the 12 scientific uncertainties (Section 3.3 of the PSP), and whether the proposal offers a prudent approach to answer these uncertainties.# The

proposal has well-developed information on conceptual models, hypotheses and adaptive management. The monitoring program will be refined at a later stage but the approach appears sound and based on experience.*

1g. Summarize comments from section 1a through 1f related to applicability to CALFED goals and priorities. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, highlighting the applicability of the proposed project to CALFED and CVPIA goals and priorities. Focus on aspects of the proposal that may be important to later stages in the project review and selection process.# This Phase 2 proposal is expensive. The proposal is well developed and encompasses all the important elements from the PSP and addresses

important types of habitats in a key portion of the Delta. The proposal will probably not provide benefits to listed fish species such as delta smelt,

splittail, or anadromous salmonids (except under extreme high flow situations).*

APPLICABILITY TO CVPIA PRIORITIES

1i. Describe the expected contribution to natural production of anadromous fish. Specifically identify the species and races of anadromous fish that are expected to benefit from the project, the expected magnitude of the contribution to natural production for each species and race of anadromous fish, the certainty of the expected benefits, and the immediacy and duration of the expected contribution. Provide quantitative support where available (for example, expected increases in population indices, cohort replacement rates, or reductions in mortality rates).# No anadromous fish are expected to directly benefit from the project.*

1j. List the threatened or endangered species that are expected to benefit from the project. Specifically identify the status of the species and races of anadromous fish that are expected to benefit from the project, any other special-status species that are expected to benefit, and the ecological community or multiple-species benefits that are expected to occur as a result of implementing the project.# No anadromous fish are expected to benefit. As special-status species, giant garter snake, Valley Elderberry long-horn beetle are expected to benefit. The upland, wetland habitat ecosystem and its multiple plant and animal species are expected to benefit.*

1k. Identify if and describe how the project protects and restores natural channel and riparian habitat values. Specifically address whether the project protects and restores natural channel and riparian habitat values, whether the project promotes natural processes, and the immediacy and duration of benefits to natural channel and riparian habitat values.# The project promotes and restores riparian habitat values by establishing a flood flow relief system, protecting riparian and wetland habitat on levees, creating added floodplain capacity, and by enlarging a large marsh complex with perennial open water and tule marshes. The project promotes natural processes by restoring wetland habitat physical features that should result in more natural processes to operate at the site. The riparian habitat value benefits have a long term, continuous duration if the restored habitat is maintained.*

1l. Identify if and how the project contributes to efforts to modify CVP operations. Identify the effort(s) to modify CVP operations to which the proposed project would contribute, if applicable. Efforts to modify CVP operations include modifications to provide flows of suitable quality,

quantity, and timing to protect all life stages of anadromous fish as directed by Section 3406 (b)(1)(B) of the CVPIA, including flows provided through management of water dedicated under Section 3406(b)(2) and water acquired pursuant to Section 3406(b)(3).# The project will not contribute to modified CVP operations.*

1m. Identify if and how the project contributes to implementation of the supporting measures in the CVPIA. Identify the supporting measure(s) to which the proposed project would contribute, if applicable. Supporting measures include the Water Acquisition Program, the Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program, the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, and others.# The project would contribute to the b(1)-other Habitat Restoration Program.*

1n. Summarize comments from section 1i through 1m related to applicability to CVPIA priorities (if applicable, identify the CVPIA program appropriate to consider as the source of CVPIA funding [for example, the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Habitat Restoration Program, Water Acquisition Program, Tracy Pumping Plant Mitigation Program, Clear Creek Restoration Program, Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring Program, and Anadromous Fish Screen Program]). Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, highlighting the applicability of the proposed project to CALFED and CVPIA goals and priorities. Focus on aspects of the proposal that may be important to later stages in the project review and selection process.# The Habitat Restoration Program 3406(b)(1)-other could possibly fund the proposal as it increases Central Valley wildlife habitat. The project has good potential to restore wildlife habitat in the north delta with benefits to listed species and supports the CVPIA goal of improving conditions of fish and wildlife affected by the CVP.*

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS

2a. Did the applicant explain how the proposed project relates to other past and future ecosystem restoration projects, as required on page 57 in the PSP? Type in yes or no.#yes.*

2b. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on other information on restoration projects available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, describe how the proposed project complements other ecosystem restoration projects, including CALFED and CVPIA. Identify projects or types of projects that the proposed project would complement, now or in the future. Identify source of information.#Restoration of property contributes to program goals of the Sacramento County Plan and South Sacramento County Habitat Conservation Plan. Also supports goals of CVPIA

(AFRP), FWS Central Valley San Francisco Bay Ecoregion Plan, CVHJV Plan, Stone Lakes NWR, and other programs. Source: Proposal*

RESULTS AND PROGRESS ON PREVIOUSLY FUNDED CALFED AND CVPIA PROJECTS, INCLUDING REQUESTS FOR NEXT-PHASE FUNDING

3a1. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on project reports and data available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, has the applicant previously received CALFED or CVPIA funding? Type CALFED, CVPIA, both, or none.#CALFED.*

3a2. If the answer is yes, list the project number(s), project name(s) and whether CALFED or CVPIA funding. If the answer is none, move on to item 4.#
98F12 - Stone Lakes NWR Land Acquisition (Sun River Property).*

3b1. Based on the information presented in the proposal and on project reports available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, did the applicant accurately state the current status of the project(s) and the progress and accomplishments of the project(s) to date? Type yes or no.#yes.*

3b2. If the answer is no, identify the inaccuracies:#

3c1. Has the progress to date been satisfactory? Type yes or no.#yes.*

3c2. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answer, including source of information (proposal or other source):#Previous Phase included acquisition (complete) and initial restoration and permit planning, which is ongoing and scheduled to be completed 3/01. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports*

REQUESTS FOR NOXT-PHASE FUNDING

3d1. Is the applicant requesting next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#yes.*

3d2. If the answer is yes, list previous-phase project number(s) here. If the answer is no, move on to item 4.#
98F12.*

3e1. Does the proposal contain a 2-page summary, as required on pages 57 and 58 of the PSP? Type yes or no.#yes.*

3e2. Based on the information presented in the summary and on project reports available to CALFED and CVPIA staff, is the project ready for next-phase funding? Type yes or no.#yes.*

3e3. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers, including source of information (proposal or other source):#Property has been acquired and initial restoration and permit planning ongoing. Will be ready for implementation in March 2001. Source: Proposal, quarterly reports*

LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

4a. Does the proposal describe a plan for public outreach, as required on page 61 of the PSP? Type yes or no.# Yes.*

4b. Based on the information in the proposal, highlight outstanding issues related to support or opposition for the project by local entities including watershed groups and local governments, and the expected magnitude of any potential third-party impacts.# The project

has support from a variety of agencies, organizations and public individuals and opposition from some farming groups.*

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

4d. List any potential environmental compliance or access issues as identified in the PSP checklists.# All compliance and access issues are addressed and Environmental Documents should be completed by spring of 2001.*

4e. Specifically highlight and comment on any regulatory issues listed above that may prevent the project from meeting the projected timeline.# Since this is a federal project in a floodplain, Executive Order 11988 may apply. I don't see this as a problem for timelines.*

COST

5a. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support? Type yes or no.# yes*

5b. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified? Type yes or no.# yes*

5c. Is the overhead clearly identified? Type yes or no.# yes*

5d. Are project management costs clearly identified? Type yes or no.# yes*

5e. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 5a - 5d.# All information requested has been provided by project proponent in a clear, concise, and understandable format.*

COST SHARING

6a. Does the proposal contain cost-sharing? Type yes or no.# yes*

6b. Are applicants specifically requesting either state or federal cost share dollars? Type state, federal, or doesn't matter.# federal*

6c. List cost share given in proposal and note whether listed cost share is identified (in hand) or proposed.

6c1. In-kind:# n/a*

6c2. Matching funds:# \$831,987.00*

6c3. Show percentage that cost sharing is of total amount of funding requested along with calculation.# 37%. \$831,987 divided by \$2,223,404*

6d. Please provide detailed comments in support of your answers to questions 6a - 6c3.# n/a*

